Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application, and are rejected in the Office Action of November 3, 2005. Claims 1-6, 9-10 and 12 are amended herein.

Re: Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 7, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,003,041 issued to Wugofski (hereinafter, "Wugofski"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection since Wugofski fails to teach or suggest all elements of the claimed invention. In particular, independent claim 1 includes steps of:

> "(a) commanding a peripheral device, connected to said video processing apparatus, to transmit a ***test signal pattern*** from an analog output of said peripheral device;
> (b) receiving said test signal pattern from said peripheral device on one of a plurality of analog inputs of said video processing apparatus, ***wherein said video processing apparatus is capable of distinguishing said test signal pattern from other signals received on said analog inputs***;
> (c) enabling said video processing apparatus to determine which one of said plurality of analog inputs receives said test signal pattern; and
> (d) storing data, in said video processing apparatus, associated with said analog input which has received said test signal pattern." (emphasis added)

As indicated above, independent claim 1 defines a method for controlling a video processing apparatus in which the video processing apparatus commands a peripheral device to transmit a test signal pattern from an analog output. The video processing apparatus receives the test signal pattern on one of its analog inputs, and is capable of distinguishing this test signal pattern from other signals it receives on its analog inputs. The video processing apparatus (not a user) determines which of its analog inputs

receives the test signal pattern, and stores data associated with the analog input that receives the test signal pattern.

Wugofski fails to teach or suggest the invention of independent claim 1 and its respective dependent claims. As indicated by Applicants in a previous response, Wugofski requires a user to manually identify a peripheral device and a port number (the alleged "analog input") of a computer system (the alleged "video processing apparatus") in order to determine the connectivity between the peripheral device and the computer system (see column 6, lines 24-27). Wugofski fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a method for controlling a video processing apparatus comprising steps of commanding a peripheral device connected to the video processing apparatus to transmit a ***test signal pattern*** from an analog output of the peripheral device, receiving the test signal pattern on one of a plurality of analog inputs of the video processing apparatus, ***wherein the video processing apparatus is capable of distinguishing the test signal pattern from other signals received on the analog inputs,*** and enabling the video processing apparatus to determine which one of the plurality of analog inputs receives the test signal pattern, as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1, 2, 7, 8 and 9 are patentable over Wugofski, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Re: Rejection of Claims 3-6 and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3-6 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wugofski in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,529,680 issued to Broberg (hereinafter, "Broberg"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection since neither

Wugofski nor Broberg, whether taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest all elements of the claimed invention. In particular, independent claims 10 and 12 include steps of:

> "(a) selecting one of said plurality of peripheral devices;
> (b) sending a command, via said digital bus, to said selected peripheral device for commanding said selected peripheral device to transmit a ***test signal pattern*** from an analog output of said selected peripheral device;
> (c) receiving said test signal pattern from said selected peripheral device on one of said analog inputs of said video processing apparatus, ***wherein said video processing apparatus is capable of distinguishing said test signal pattern from other signals received on said analog inputs***;
> (d) monitoring each of said plurality of analog inputs to determine which of said plurality of analog inputs receives said test signal pattern; and
> (e) repeating steps (a), (b), (c) and (d) for each of the other ones of said plurality of peripheral devices for automatically constructing a map of the analog interconnectivity of each said peripheral device connected to said video processing apparatus" (see claim 10 - emphasis added), and

> "(a) sending a first command, via said digital bus, to said first peripheral device to switch said first peripheral device into a pass through operating mode;
> (b) sending a second command, via said digital bus, to said second peripheral device to transmit a ***test signal pattern*** from an analog output of said second peripheral device;
> (c) receiving said test signal pattern from said second peripheral device on one of said analog inputs of said video processing apparatus, ***wherein said video processing apparatus is capable of distinguishing said test signal pattern from other signals received on said analog inputs***; and
> (d) monitoring each of said analog inputs to determine which one of said analog inputs receives said test signal pattern." (see claim 12 - emphasis added)

As indicated above, independent claims 10 and 12 define methods in which a video processing apparatus commands a peripheral device to transmit a test signal pattern from an analog output. The video processing apparatus receives the test signal pattern on one of its analog inputs, and is capable of distinguishing this test signal

pattern from other signals it receives on its analog inputs. Based on this capability, the video processing apparatus determines which of its analog inputs receives the test signal pattern, and may thereby construct a map of the analog interconnectivity of each peripheral device connected to the video processing apparatus.

Neither Wugofski nor Broberg, whether taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest, *inter alia*, the use a "test signal pattern" for purposes of defining the interconnectivity between a peripheral device and a video processing apparatus having a plurality of analog inputs in which the "video processing apparatus is capable of distinguishing said test signal pattern from other signals received on said analog inputs," as claimed.

On page 8 of the Office Action of November 3, 2005, the Examiner relies on Broberg for using an "appropriate video signal" for determining whether or not to add devices and channels to a channel map decision list 60 (see column 5, column 54-64). This "appropriate video signal" of Broberg, however, is different from the claimed "test signal pattern." Although undefined, the context of Broberg (i.e., setting up a channel map decision list) suggests that the "appropriate video signal" may be simply a video signal having signal strength indicative of a valid channel. Nowhere does Broberg teach or suggest that this "appropriate video signal" exhibit any type of pattern as claimed. Moreover, Broberg nowhere teaches or suggests that its device is capable of distinguishing this "appropriate video signal" from other signals received on its analog inputs, as claimed. In fact, the context of Broberg suggests just the opposite since multiple "appropriate video signals" (e.g., video signals having signal strength indicative

of a valid channel) may presumably be present at the same time on multiple inputs (e.g., VCR input, satellite receiver input, etc.) of its device. As such, the device of Broberg would be unable to distinguish one "appropriate video signal" on one input (e.g., VCR input) from another "appropriate video signal" on another input (e.g., satellite receiver input). Accordingly, the proposed combination including Broberg fails to teach or suggest a "video processing apparatus [that] is capable of distinguishing said test signal pattern from other signals received on said analog inputs," as claimed. In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that claims 3-6 and 10-13 are patentable over the proposed combination of Wugofski and Broberg, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks/arguments, Applicants believe this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' attorney at (609) 734-6813, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Fee

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Reitseng Lin
Reg. No. 42,804
Phone (609) 734-6813

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
February 2, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on:

February 2, 2006
Date

Patricia M. Fedorowycz